

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

Paige Gaglione and Ariel K. Redden,  
Plaintiffs,

vs.

Bistecca Corp. dba Harry Buffalo Parma  
Heights and Robert T. George,  
Defendants.

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT**

COME NOW Plaintiffs, Paige Gaglione (“Plaintiff Paige Gaglione”) and Ariel K. Redden (“Plaintiff Ariel Redden”) (collectively “Plaintiffs”), individually, by and through the undersigned attorney and sue the Defendants, Bistecca Corp. dba Harry Buffalo Parma Heights. (“Defendant Harry Buffalo”) and Robert T. George (“Defendant Robert George”) (collectively, “Defendants”), and they allege as follows:

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1. Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants. This is an action for equitable relief, minimum wage, overtime pay, liquidated damages, attorneys’ fees, costs, and interest under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), as amended, and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

2. The FLSA was enacted “to protect all covered workers from substandard wages and oppressive working hours.” Barrentine v. Ark Best Freight Sys. Inc., 450 U.S. 728, 739 (1981). Under the FLSA, employers must pay their employees a minimum wage. See 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) (“Section 6(a)”). The FLSA’s definition of the term “wage,” in turn, recognizes that under certain circumstances, an employer of tipped employees may credit a portion of its employees’ tips against its minimum wage obligation, a practice commonly referred to as taking a “tip credit.” See id. § 203(m).

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* This civil action arises under the Constitution and law of the United States.

4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(ii) because acts giving rise to the claims of the Plaintiffs occurred within the Northern District of Ohio, and Defendants regularly conduct business in and have engaged in the wrongful conduct alleged herein – and, thus, are subject to personal jurisdiction in – this judicial district.

### **PARTIES**

5. At all material times, Plaintiff Paige Gaglione is a resident of Cuyahoga County, Ohio and the Northern District of Ohio, and is a former employee of Defendants.

6. At all material times, Plaintiff Ariel Redden is a resident of Cuyahoga County, Ohio and the Northern District of Ohio, and is a former employee of Defendants.

1           7.       At all material times, Harry Buffalo was a corporation duly licensed to transact  
2 business in the State of Ohio. Defendant Harry Buffalo does business, has offices, and/or  
3 maintains agents for the transaction of its customary business in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

4           8.       At all relevant times, Defendant Harry Buffalo owns, operates as, and/or does  
5 business as Harry Buffalo Parma Heights, a restaurant and bar located in Parma Heights,  
6 Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

7           9.       At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant Harry Buffalo.  
8  
9 At all relevant times, Defendant Harry Buffalo, acting through its agents, representatives,  
10 employees, managers, members, and/or other representatives had the authority to hire and  
11 fire employees, supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment,  
12 determined the rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in  
13 connection with Plaintiffs' Employment. In any event, at all relevant times, Defendant Harry  
14 Buffalo was an employer subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and employed  
15 Plaintiffs.  
16

17           10.      At all relevant times, Defendant Robert George owns, operates as a manager  
18 of, operates as an officer of, and/or possesses a similar interest in Defendant Harry Buffalo.  
19 At all relevant times, Defendant Robert George had the authority to hire and fire employees,  
20 supervised and controlled work schedules or the conditions of employment, determined the  
21 rate and method of payment, and maintained employment records in connection with  
22 Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant Harry Buffalo. In any event, at all relevant times,  
23 Defendant Robert George was an employer subject to the FLSA and employed Plaintiffs.  
24  
25  
26  
27



1 approximately November 30, 2014. Plaintiff Ariel Redden was paid as and worked as a  
2 tipped employee from approximately November 1, 2011 through approximately November  
3 30, 2014.

4 19. Plaintiffs are covered employees within the meaning of the Fair Labor  
5 Standards Act (“FLSA”).  
6

7 20. At all relevant times, Defendants own and/or operate Harry Buffalo Parma  
8 Heights in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

9 21. Plaintiffs are low paid laborers who work in a high stress environment across  
10 Cuyahoga County, Ohio.  
11

12 22. Rather than pay its tipped employees, Plaintiffs, the applicable state minimum  
13 wage, for the time Plaintiffs were paid an hourly wage, Defendants imposed a tip credit upon  
14 Plaintiffs at below the applicable minimum wage.

15 23. As a result of Defendant’s imposition of a tip credit, Plaintiffs were forced to  
16 perform work at an hourly rate that was less than the applicable minimum wage.  
17

18 24. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(m), and Ohio wage and hour law,  
19 employers may impose a tip credit on their tipped employees’ wages of up to one-half of the  
20 Ohio minimum wage per hour, on the condition that, among other requirements, such  
21 employees have been informed by the employer of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m).  
22

23 25. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiffs of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m)  
24 at any time over the duration of their employment with Defendants. As such, Defendants  
25 were not entitled to impose any tip credit upon Plaintiffs’ wages, and Defendants should  
26  
27

1 have therefore paid the full Ohio minimum wage to Plaintiffs for all time they worked  
2 during the course of their regular workweeks.

3 26. As such, full minimum wage for such time is owed to Plaintiffs for the entire  
4 time they were employed by Defendants.

5 27. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of altering Plaintiffs' time records  
6 so that wages were not paid for work performed before, during, and after Plaintiffs'  
7 scheduled shift hours.  
8

9 28. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of requiring Plaintiffs to perform  
10 work while not "clocked in" to Defendants' time recording system.

11 29. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiffs for such  
12 time worked, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall minimum wage for the work  
13 Plaintiffs performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiffs' hourly wages was  
14 less than the applicable minimum wage.  
15

16 30. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff the applicable  
17 minimum wage for all hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).  
18

19 31. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their  
20 intentional time clock manipulation would violate federal and state law, and Defendants  
21 were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during Plaintiff employment. As such,  
22 Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA.  
23

24 32. Defendants have and continue to willfully violate the FLSA by not paying  
25 Plaintiffs a wage for time spent working due to intentional manipulation of Plaintiffs' time  
26 records.  
27

1           33. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of requiring Plaintiffs to perform a  
2 substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to their tipped occupation in excess of 20%  
3 of their regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation over  
4 the course of their regular workweeks.

5           34. As a result of Defendants' willful requirement that Plaintiffs perform a  
6 substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to their tipped occupation in excess of 20%  
7 of their regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation over  
8 the course of their regular workweeks, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall  
9 minimum wage for such work that Plaintiffs performed for Defendants, such that the  
10 average of Plaintiffs' hourly wages was less than the applicable minimum wage.  
11

12           35. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff the applicable  
13 minimum wage for such hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).  
14

15           36. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their  
16 failure to pay to Plaintiffs the full applicable minimum wage, without applying the tip credit,  
17 for time spent performing labor in such a non-tipped occupation, would violate federal and  
18 state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during  
19 Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the  
20 FLSA.  
21

22           37. Defendants have and continue to willfully violate the FLSA by not paying  
23 Plaintiffs the full applicable minimum wage for time spent performing non-tipped labor  
24 related to their tipped occupation in excess of 20% of their workweeks, and non-tipped  
25 labor unrelated to their tipped occupation over the course of their workweeks.  
26  
27

38. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and exercised control over Plaintiff's work and wages at all relevant times.

39. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from Defendants compensation for unpaid wages, an additional amount equal amount as liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

**COUNT I**  
**FLSA: TIME CLOCK MANIPULATION & REQUIRED OFF-CLOCK WORK**

40. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

41. Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of violating the FLSA, as detailed in this Complaint.

42. At all relevant times, Defendants have been and continue to be employers and enterprise engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(d) and (s), respectively.

43. At all relevant times, Defendants employed Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(e) and (g), respectively.

44. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of altering Plaintiffs' time records so that wages were not paid for work performed before, during, and after Plaintiffs' scheduled shift hours.

45. Defendants engaged in the regular practice of requiring Plaintiffs to perform work while not "clocked in" to Defendants' time recording system.



1           46. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiffs for such  
2 time worked, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall minimum wage for the work  
3 Plaintiffs performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiffs' hourly wages was  
4 less than the applicable minimum wage.

5           47. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiff the applicable  
6 minimum wage for all hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).  
7

8           48. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their  
9 intentional time clock manipulation would violate federal and state law, and Defendants  
10 were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during Plaintiffs' employment. As  
11 such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA.  
12

13           49. Defendants have and continue to willfully violate the FLSA by not paying  
14 Plaintiffs a wage for time spent working due to intentional manipulation of Plaintiffs' time  
15 records.  
16

17           50. For example, and upon information and belief, during the workweek of  
18 January 4, 2014, Defendants altered Plaintiff Paige Gaglione's time records so as to indicate  
19 that Plaintiff Paige Gaglione did not perform labor for Defendants for times during which  
20 Plaintiff Paige Gaglione did in fact perform labor for Defendants.

21           51. During the same workweek, upon information and believe, Defendants also  
22 engaged in the regular practice of requiring and/or allowing Plaintiff Paige Gaglione to  
23 perform work while not "clocked in" to Defendants' time recording system.  
24  
25  
26  
27

53. For example, and upon information and belief, during the workweek of January 4, 2014, Defendants altered Plaintiff Ariel Redden's time records so as to indicate that Plaintiff Ariel Redden did not perform labor for Defendants for times during which Plaintiff Ariel Redden did in fact perform labor for Defendants.

54. During the same workweek, upon information and believe, Defendants also engaged in the regular practice of requiring and/or allowing Plaintiff Ariel Redden to perform work while not “clocked in” to Defendants’ time recording system.

55. As a result of Defendants' willful conduct, a wage was never paid to Plaintiff Ariel Redden for time she spent working, thus bringing her wages below minimum wage, in willful violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

56. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and exercised control over Plaintiffs' work and wages at all relevant times.

57. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from Defendants compensation for unpaid wages, an additional amount equal amount as liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

**COUNT II**  
**FLSA: NON-TIPPED LABOR RELATED TO TIPPED OCCUPATION IN**  
**EXCESS OF 20% OF TIME WORKED & NON-TIPPED LABOR UNRELATED**  
**TO TIPPED OCCUPATION**

1           58.     Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding  
2 paragraphs.

3           59.     Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of  
4 violating the FLSA, as detailed in this Complaint.

5           60.     At all relevant times, Defendants have been and continue to be employers and  
6 enterprise engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, within the  
7 meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(d) and (s), respectively.

8           61.     At all relevant times, Defendants employed Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs were  
9 employed by Defendants, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(e) and (g),  
10 respectively.  
11

12           62.     Defendants engaged in the regular practice of requiring Plaintiffs to perform a  
13 substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to their tipped occupation in excess of 20%  
14 of their regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation over  
15 the course of their regular workweeks.  
16

17           63.     Examples of non-tipped labor related to Plaintiffs' tipped occupation that  
18 exceeded 20% of Plaintiffs' regular workweek, include, but are not limited to: preparatory  
19 and workplace maintenance tasks such as brewing tea, brewing coffee, rolling silverware,  
20 cleaning soft drink dispensers, wiping down tables, setting tables, busing tables, cutting and  
21 stocking fruit, stocking ice, taking out trash, scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, restocking to-  
22 go supplies, cleaning booths, cleaning ramekins, sweeping, mopping, restocking all stations,  
23 washing dishes, breaking down and cleaning the expo line, and cleaning and stocking  
24 restrooms.  
25  
26  
27

1           64.     Examples of non-tipped labor unrelated to Plaintiffs' tipped occupation that  
2 Plaintiffs performed during their regular workweeks, include, but are not limited to:  
3 preparatory and workplace maintenance tasks such as taking out trash, scrubbing walls,  
4 sweeping floors, cleaning booths, sweeping, mopping, washing dishes, breaking down and  
5 cleaning the expo line, and cleaning and stocking restrooms.

6  
7           65.     As a result of Defendants' willful requirement that Plaintiffs perform a  
8 substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to their tipped occupation in excess of 20%  
9 of their regular workweeks and non-tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation over  
10 the course of their regular workweeks, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall  
11 minimum wage for such work that Plaintiffs performed for Defendants, such that the  
12 average of Plaintiffs' hourly wages was less than the applicable minimum wage.

13  
14           66.     In both policy and practice, Defendants regularly and consistently required  
15 Plaintiffs to perform the above-listed non-tipped labor related to their tipped occupation in  
16 excess of twenty percent (20%) of Plaintiffs' regular workweek before, during, and after  
17 scheduled shifts; before the restaurant was open to customers; after the restaurant was  
18 closed to customers; while Plaintiffs had few to no customers to serve; before serving their  
19 first customer; and after being "cut" from serving customers.

20  
21           67.     In both policy and practice, Defendants regularly and consistently required  
22 Plaintiffs to perform the above-listed non-tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation  
23 during the course of Plaintiffs' regular workweek before, during, and after scheduled shifts;  
24 before the restaurant was open to customers; after the restaurant was closed to customers;

1 while Plaintiffs had few to no customers to serve; before serving their first customer; and  
2 after being “cut” from serving customers.

3 68. As a result of Defendants’ requirement that Plaintiffs perform such non-  
4 tipped labor related to their tipped occupation, and in excess of twenty percent (20%) of  
5 their regular workweek, while earning the reduced tip credit rate, Plaintiffs were engaged in a  
6 non-tipped occupation, as defined by the “dual jobs” regulation 29 C.F.R. §§ 531.56(e) and  
7 (a) and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook §30d00(e), for such work  
8 performed during that time. Such work performed by Plaintiffs included, but was not limited  
9 to, spending more than part of their time cleaning and setting tables and making coffee, and  
10 more than occasionally washing dishes or glasses. As a result, Defendants were prohibited  
11 from taking the tip credit for the hours Plaintiffs spent working in their non-tipped  
12 occupation. Plaintiffs are, therefore, entitled, under 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(a), to the overall  
13 minimum wage for all time spent performing such non-tipped, dual occupation labor. As  
14 such, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall minimum wage for the work Plaintiffs  
15 performed during their regular workweek, in willful violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §  
16 206(a).  
17

18 69. As a result of Defendants’ requirement that Plaintiffs perform such non-  
19 tipped labor unrelated to their tipped occupation, while earning the reduced tip credit rate,  
20 Plaintiffs were engaged in a non-tipped occupation, as defined by the “dual jobs” regulation  
21 29 C.F.R. §§ 531.56(e) and (a) and the Department of Labor Field Operations Handbook  
22 §30d00(e), for such work performed during that time. Such work performed by Plaintiffs  
23 included, but was not limited to, spending more than part of their time cleaning and setting  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 tables and making coffee, and more than occasionally washing dishes or glasses. As a result,  
2 Defendants were prohibited from taking the tip credit for the hours Plaintiffs spent working  
3 in their non-tipped occupation. Plaintiffs are, therefore, entitled, under 29 C.F.R. § 531.56(a),  
4 to the overall minimum wage for all time spent performing such non-tipped, dual  
5 occupation labor. As such, Defendants paid Plaintiffs less than the overall minimum wage  
6 for the work Plaintiffs performed during their regular workweek, in willful violation of the  
7 FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

9 70. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiffs the  
10 applicable minimum wage for such hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. §  
11 206(a).

12 71. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their  
13 failure to pay to Plaintiffs the full applicable minimum wage, without applying the tip credit,  
14 for time spent performing labor in such a non-tipped occupation, would violate federal and  
15 state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA minimum wage requirements during  
16 Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful violation of the  
17 FLSA.

18 72. Defendants have willfully violated the FLSA by not paying Plaintiffs the full  
19 applicable minimum wage for time spent performing non-tipped labor related to their tipped  
20 occupation in excess of 20% of their workweeks, and non-tipped labor unrelated to their  
21 tipped occupation over the course of their workweeks.

22 73. For example, during each and every workweek for which Plaintiff Paige  
23 Gaglione worked for Defendants as a tipped employee, Defendants required Plaintiff Paige  
24

1 Gaglione to perform a substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to her tipped  
2 occupation in excess of 20% of her regular workweek and non-tipped labor unrelated to her  
3 tipped occupation over the course of her regular workweek. Defendants paid Plaintiff Paige  
4 Gaglione less than the overall minimum wage for such work that Plaintiff Paige Gaglione  
5 performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiff Paige Gaglione's hourly wages  
6 was less than the applicable minimum wage, in willful violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).  
7 Defendants required Plaintiff Paige Gaglione to perform non-tipped labor related to her  
8 tipped occupation in excess of 20% of her regular workweek and non-tipped labor unrelated  
9 to her tipped occupation each and every workweek during which she worked for  
10 Defendants.  
11

12 74. For example, during each and every workweek for which Plaintiff Ariel  
13 Redden worked for Defendants as a tipped employee, Defendants required Plaintiff Ariel  
14 Redden to perform a substantial amount of non-tipped labor related to her tipped  
15 occupation in excess of 20% of her regular workweek and non-tipped labor unrelated to her  
16 tipped occupation over the course of her regular workweek. Defendants paid Plaintiff Ariel  
17 Redden less than the overall minimum wage for such work that Plaintiff Ariel Redden  
18 performed for Defendants, such that the average of Plaintiff Ariel Redden's hourly wages  
19 was less than the applicable minimum wage, in willful violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).  
20 Defendants required Plaintiff Ariel Redden to perform non-tipped labor related to her  
21 tipped occupation in excess of 20% of her regular workweek and non-tipped labor unrelated  
22 to her tipped occupation each and every workweek during which she worked for  
23 Defendants.  
24  
25  
26  
27

1           75.     Plaintiffs believe and therefore aver that Defendants owe them similar wages  
2 for each and every workweek during which they worked for Defendants for the entire  
3 duration of their employment. Furthermore, when an employer fails to keep complete and  
4 accurate time records, employees may establish the hours worked by their testimony, and the  
5 burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer.  
6

7           76.     Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and  
8 exercised control over Plaintiffs' work and wages at all relevant times.

9           77.     Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover  
10 from Defendants compensation for unpaid wages, an additional amount equal amount as  
11 liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this action under 29  
12 U.S.C. § 216(b).  
13  
14

15                                   **COUNT III FLSA:**  
16                                   **FAILURE TO GIVE NOTICE OF TIP CREDIT**

17           78.     Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding  
18 paragraphs.  
19

20           79.     Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of  
21 violating the FLSA, as detailed in this Complaint.

22           80.     At all relevant times, Defendants have been and continue to be employers and  
23 enterprise engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, within the  
24 meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(d) and (s), respectively.  
25  
26  
27



1           81. At all relevant times, Defendants employed Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs were  
2 employed by Defendants, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(e) and (g),  
3 respectively.

4           82. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(m), and Ohio wage and hour law,  
5 employers may impose a tip credit on their tipped employees' wages of up to one-half of the  
6 Ohio minimum wage per hour, on the condition that, among other requirements, such  
7 employees have been informed by the employer of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m).  
8

9           83. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiffs of the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m)  
10 at any time over the duration of their employment with Defendants. As such, Defendants  
11 were not entitled to impose any tip credit upon Plaintiffs' wages, and Defendants should  
12 have therefore paid the full Ohio minimum wage to Plaintiffs for all time they worked  
13 during the course of their regular workweeks.  
14

15           84. As a result of Defendants' willful failure to compensate Plaintiffs the  
16 applicable minimum wage for such hours worked, Defendants have violated 29 U.S.C. §  
17 206(a).  
18

19           85. As such, Defendants owe to Plaintiffs the difference between the full  
20 minimum wage and wages paid for the entire time they were employed as tipped employees  
21 by Defendants.  
22

23           86. Defendants knew that – or acted with reckless disregard as to whether – their  
24 failure to pay to Plaintiffs minimum wage for all work performed during their regular  
25 workweek would violate federal and state law, and Defendants were aware of the FLSA  
26  
27

1 minimum wage requirements during Plaintiff's employment. As such, Defendants' conduct  
2 constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA.

3 87. Defendants have and continue to willfully violate the FLSA by not paying  
4 Plaintiffs the applicable minimum wage for all work performed during each and every  
5 workweek during which Plaintiffs worked for Defendants.  
6

7 88. Plaintiffs believe and therefore aver that Defendants owe them similar wages  
8 for each and every workweek they worked for Defendants, for the entire duration of their  
9 employment. Furthermore, when an employer fails to keep complete and accurate time  
10 records, employees may establish the hours worked by their testimony, and the burden of  
11 overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer.  
12

13 89. Defendants individually and/or through an enterprise or agent, directed and  
14 exercised control over Plaintiffs' work and wages at all relevant times.

15 90. Plaintiffs, in their work for Defendants, were employed by an enterprise  
16 engaged in commerce that had annual gross sales of at least \$500,000.  
17

18 91. Due to Defendants' illegal wage practices, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover  
19 from Defendants compensation for unpaid wages, an additional amount equal amount as  
20 liquidated damages, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this action under 29  
21 U.S.C. § 216(b).  
22

### 23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs, Paige Gaglione and Ariel Redden, individually,  
25 respectfully request that this Court grant the following relief in Plaintiffs' favor, and against  
26 Defendants:  
27

- 1 A. Unpaid minimum wages and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages  
2 pursuant to the FLSA and the supporting United States Department of Labor  
3 Regulations;  
4 B. Prejudgment and post-judgment interest;  
5 C. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §  
6 216(b); and  
7 D. Such other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.

8  
9 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

10 Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

11 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2015.

12 THE BENDAU LAW FIRM, PLLC

13 By: /s/ Clifford P. Bendau, II  
14 Clifford P. Bendau, II (OH# 0089601)  
15 THE BENDAU LAW FIRM PLLC  
16 6350 East Thomas Road, Suite 330  
17 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
18 Telephone AZ: (480) 296-7887  
19 Telephone OH: (216) 395-4226  
20 Facsimile: (480) 429-3679  
21 Email: [cliffordbendau@bendaulaw.com](mailto:cliffordbendau@bendaulaw.com)

22 By: /s/ James L. Simon  
23 James L. SIMON (#0089483)  
24 6000 Freedom Square Drive  
25 Freedom Square II – Suite 165  
26 Independence, Ohio 44131  
27 Telephone: (216) 525-8890  
Facsimile: (216) 642-5814  
Email: [jameslsimonlaw@yahoo.com](mailto:jameslsimonlaw@yahoo.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiff*